

REMARKS

These Remarks are in reply to the final Office Action mailed April 16, 2009 and the Advisory Action mailed August 5, 2009. Claims 1-2, 5-12, 15-16 and 19-29 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 10-12, 15, 22, 23 and 26-29 are currently being amended. No claims are currently being canceled or added (claims 3-4, 13-14 and 17-18 were previously canceled). Accordingly, claims 1-2, 5-12, 15-16 and 19-29 remain pending for the Examiner's consideration, with claims 1, 10 and 22 being independent. Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn in view of the remarks below.

I. Summary of Prior Art Claim Rejections

Claims 1-4, 7, 10-14, 19 and 22-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,841,828 to Suzuki (hereafter referred to as "Suzuki") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,471,411 to Adams et al. (hereafter referred to as "Adams") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,727,505 to Konishi et al. (hereafter referred to as "Konishi").

Claims 5, 6, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Adams and Konishi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,928,313 to Thompson (hereafter referred to as "Thompson").

Claims 8, 9, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Adams and Konishi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,411,333 to Auld et al. (hereafter referred to as "Auld").

(a discussion of the claims begins on the next page)

II. Discussion of the Claims

Claim 1, as amended, is reproduced below for the convenience of the Examiner.

1. (Currently Amended) A method comprising:
storing a plurality of independent sets of filter coefficients in a memory,
wherein each set of filter coefficients defines a different polyphase filter function, wherein each of the different polyphase filter functions would result in at least some modifying of a signal if the signal were filtered in accordance with the polyphase filter function, and wherein each of the different polyphase filter functions would result in modifying of a signal in a different manner than the other polyphase filter functions;
selecting a single one of the independent sets of filter coefficients;
estimating a sample rate of an input signal;
interpolating the single one selected set of filter coefficients, in dependence on the estimated sample rate of the input signal, to thereby produce interpolated selected polyphase filter coefficients;
and
convolving the produced interpolated selected polyphase filter coefficients with ~~an~~ the input signal to produce a filtered output signal that differs from the input signal regardless of which single one of the sets of filter coefficients is selected.

Claim 1, as amended, includes the steps of “selecting a single one of the independent sets of filter coefficients”, “estimating a sample rate of an input signal” and “interpolating the single one selected set of filter coefficients, in dependence on the estimated sample rate of the input signal, to thereby produce interpolated polyphase filter coefficients”. The last two features are discussed, e.g., in paragraphs [0046] – [0048] of the present application as originally filed.

Suzuki (at column 23, lines 31-51) appears to teach that a different set of filter coefficients can be stored for each of a plurality of different key touch strengths, tone pitches and tone colors. For example, a first set of filter coefficients can be stored for a waveshape corresponding to a strong key touch, and a second set of filter coefficients can be stored for a waveshape corresponding to a soft key touch. Then, if a medium key touch is detected, interpolation can be used to prepare a further set of filter coefficients (corresponding to the medium key touch) using the first and second sets of filter coefficients (corresponding to the strong and weak key touches). In other words, Suzuki selects at least two sets of filter coefficients (e.g., one corresponding to a strong key touch and one corresponding to a soft key touch) and performs interpolation between the first and second sets to generate a third set of filter coefficients (e.g., one corresponding to a medium key touch).

However, Suzuki is clearly not selecting a single one of a plurality of independent sets of filter coefficients, and then interpolating the single one selected set of filter coefficients, in dependence on an estimated sample rate of the input signal, to thereby produce interpolated polyphase filter coefficients, as required by claim 1 as amended. Further, Applicants assert that Adams, Konishi, Auld and Thompson, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the deficiencies of Suzuki discussed above.

For at least the reasons specified above, Applicants respectfully request that the 103(a) rejection of claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 2, 5-9, 24 and 27 depend from and add additional features to claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are patentable for at least the reason that they depend from claim 1, as well as for the features that they add.

Claim 10, as amended, is believed to be patentable over the cited references for similar reasons to at least some of the reasons discussed above with regards to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 10 be reconsidered and withdrawn. **Claims 11, 12, 15, 16, 19-21, 25 and 28** depend from and add additional features to claim 10. Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are

patentable for at least the reason that they depend from claim 10, as well as for the features that they add.

Claim 22, as amended, is believed to be patentable over the cited references for similar reasons to those discussed above with regards to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 22 be reconsidered and withdrawn. **Claims 23, 26 and 29** depend from and add additional features to claim 22. Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are patentable for at least the reason that they depend from claim 22, as well as for the features that they add.

III. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully requested that all outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the required fees and any underpayment of fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 22, 2009

By: /Jeffrey R. Kurin/

Jeffrey R. Kurin

Reg. No. 41,132

Fliesler Meyer LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: 415/362-3800
Facsimile: 415/362-2928
Customer No. 23910